



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,678	05/22/2001	Reginald Bernard Little		8708

7590

08/15/2003

Dr. Reginald Bernard Little  
308 Great Kajes St  
Tallahassee, FL 32305

EXAMINER

LISH, PETER J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1754

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/862,678

Applicant(s)

LITTLE, REGINALD BERNARD

Examin r

Peter J Lish

Art Unit

1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on th cov r sheet with the correspond nce address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed April 11, 2003, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejections of claims 3, 5-13, and 15-23, applicant argues that the claims are modified by limiting the scope so as to take rights over processes operated within reasonable temperature limits; however it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the range of reasonable temperatures, pressures, flow rates, etc.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding rejections of claims 4 and 14, applicant argues that the disclosure is enabling in respect to PVD, arc discharge, and laser vaporization processes. However, while the disclosure may comment on the manner in which a magnetic field affects catalysts in these systems, the disclosure does not communicate the application of the magnetic field in these systems. It is thus not enabling for the use of a magnetic field in a PVD, arc discharge, or laser vaporization process, as it remains unclear as to how the magnetic field is applied in these processes.

Regarding rejections of claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, applicant argues that the claims are modified to include a more limited field intensity range, sufficient so as to affect the electronic spins in carbon and metal atoms; however it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the limited intensity) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 1754

Regarding rejections of claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), applicant argues that the reference to Harutyunyan applies magnetic fields of different magnitudes, specifically those in the range of  $10^{-2}$  T, while the instantly claimed invention applies magnetic fields in the range of  $10^{-1}$  T; however, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., magnetic fields within a particular range) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant additionally argues that the process of Harutyunyan is performed for a different purpose than that of the instantly claimed invention; however, while examiner agrees with this statement, there is no feature in the claims that differentiates between the process of Harutyunyan and that of the claimed invention. An intended use, alone, does not impart patentability, *In re Dillon* 16 USPQ 2d 1897.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 3, 5-13, and 15 -23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the growth of nanotubes under a strong external magnetic field, does not reasonably provide enablement for this process to take place at "any temperature", "any pressure", "any flowrates", "any time duration", etc. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Art Unit: 1754

Claims 4 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the process of chemical vapor deposition, does not reasonably provide enablement for the processes of arc discharge, physical deposition, or laser ablation. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 1 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "strong" in claim 1 and "intense" in claim 12 are a relative terms which renders the claim indefinite. The terms "strong" and "intense" are not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harutyunyan et al. (US 2001/0053344 A1).

The rejection of the previous office action is maintained in its entirety and incorporated herein by reference.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 1754

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Lish whose telephone number is 703-308-1772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 703-308-3837. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-305-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

PL

August 13, 2003



**STUART L. HENDRICKSON**  
PRIMARY EXAMINER